DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 263 550 CS 209 109

AUTHOR Pettey, Gary R.
TITLE The Group Antecedents of Media Use and Political Knowledge: A Conceptualization of Media Reliance.
PUB DATE Aug 85
NOTE 66p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (68th, Memphis, TN, August 3-6, 1985).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Group Dynamics; Influences; *Information Sources; Interpersonal Communication; *Knowledge Level; *Mass Media Effects; *Media Research; Perception; *Predictor Variables
IDENTIFIERS Media Gratifications; *Media Use; *Uses and Gratifications Research

ABSTRACT

A cross-sectional sample of 704 adults was interviewed in a study examining the processes that relate demographic predictors to media use and effects. It was hypothesized that primary groups influence what an individual should attend to and know about public affairs, and that the individual perceives the primary group to "prescribe" the "appropriate" manner for attaining and maintaining this level of information. Three varieties of knowledge were considered: issue knowledge, congress knowledge, and foreign knowledge. The sample was divided into those who perceived their primary/referent group for political information to be reliant on the same medium as themselves and those who perceived their group to be reliant on some other medium. Each of these groups was further divided into two groups according to reliance on television or the newspaper. The results showed that few respondents relied on media other than television or newspapers and that respondents agreed with their determined primary/referent group at a rate beyond what was to be expected by chance. Tables of findings and other materials related to the study are included in the appendixes. (HOD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED263550

The Group Antecedents of Media Use and Political Knowledge: A Conceptualization of Media Reliance

Gary R. Pettey

Mass Communications Research Center
School of Journalism and Mass Communication
University of Wisconsin-Madison
5050 Vilas Hall
821 University Ave.
Madison, Wisconsin
53706

(608) 263-4859

Paper prepared for the Theory and Methodology division of Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication annual convention, Memphis, Tennessee, August 1985

CS 209 109

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

[ ] This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
[X] Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Gary Pettey

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The Group Antecedents of Media Use and Political Knowledge:

A Conceptualization of Media Reliance

This study attempted to examine the processes that relate demographic predictors to media use and effects, primarily through the use of two concepts mediated by a third. The independent agent of interest is the primary group that is also a referent group for political information; the effect is political information (issue, congress, foreign); and the mediator is the individuals's pattern of media use for political information--conceptualized as media reliance.

This study presented regression evidence that the gratifications the individual seeks to satisfy for a certain type of information has its roots in the values and expectations of the group or groups that the individual perceives as governing the particular variety of information. Specifically it argued that primary/referent groups influence what an individual should attend to know about public affairs information. Further that the individual perceives that the primary group also "prescribes" the "appropriate" manner for attaining and maintaining this level of information.

Results generally show support for this theoretical argument. Respondents were found to agree with their determined primary/referent group at a rate beyond what was to be expected by chance.

The Group Antecedents of Media Use and Political Knowledge: A Conceptualization of Media Reliance

INTRODUCTION

The questions asked in mass communication research have changed little since the early researchers first began considering the impact of media on the world around us. One only needs to read journals from the 1930s to understand how little more we can claim as knowledge than they could (Meadowcroft and McDonald, 1983). This is certainly not to say that all of the science that has been practiced since the days of Hovland has been worthless. Methodology has certainly improved, and there is a clearer understanding of the complexity of the problems than the pioneers of our field could have had.

What one does notice over time is the change in what variables serve as "explanation" of effects. Initially demographic predictors of media use and effect were of primary concern. Certainly our field's roots in advertising and public relations are at least partially responsible for this. But beyond that (and when we do not know what else to ask) demographic characteristics of individuals or groups of individuals are relatively easy to obtain but difficult to understand. The prediction, which demographic characteristics allow, is a useful tool in our effort to gain knowledge, and the ability to predict media habits and

the impact of those habits on individuals is vital in the accumulation of knowledge. But herein lies the rub. Demographic variables may locate individuals, but without conceptual understanding of these nominally defined variables (i.e. education = number of years of school) the prediction leads to little understanding. This lack of understanding probably gave most researchers, if not the field, cause to forsake demographics to look for more interesting explanations of the genesis of media effects. Demographics were mostly relegated to controls, where their variance was simply dispensed with.

This study will attempt to examine the processes that relate demographic predictors to media use and effects, primarily through the use of two concepts mediated by a third. The independent agent of interest here is the primary group as reference group, the effect is knowledge about public affairs, and the mediator is the individual's pattern of media use for political information--specifically media reliance.

This study will attempt to demonstrate that the gratifications the individual seeks to satisfy for a certain type of information (by use of a certain mixture of sources of information) has its roots in the values and expectations of the group or groups that the individual perceives as governing the particular variety of information. Restated and cast in terms of a certain type of information, this

study will argue that primary groups influence what a person should attend to and know about public affairs information. Further that the individual perceives that the primary group also "prescribes" the "appropriate" manner for attaining and maintaining this level of information. The actual media mix used will determine correspondence between the perceived group expectation and the level of knowledge held.

GROUP INFLUENCE

The influence of reference and primary groups on the individual's attitudes and behavior is certainly not a new concern. In The Web of Group Affiliations, Simmel argues that the individual's personality is formed out of "particular elements of life, each of which has arisen from, or is interwoven with, society." Our personalities, our outlook on life, our view of the world is constrained by our membership in groups. One might think of each group's influence on the individual as a circle in a Venn diagram with the individual standing in the intersection of all the circles. A member of each, yet a composite of all.

In Conflict, Simmel continues the argument that the individual becomes an individual by first surrendering to the group. Surrendering to the appropriate norms and attitudes that give the group a form in some objective sense. Individuals retain their individualism through their own particular primary and reference group membership. The individual is, Simmel argues, both social and individual,

but the individuality grows largely out of the social component.

Simmel suggests that the means of influence on the individual group member is through a code of honor and a corresponding group of sanctions. While at first they may be imposed externally, in the end the individual chooses the group association and participates as a matter of choice.

Reference Groups

The term reference group was first used by Hyman (1942) in The Psychology of Status. In an examination of socioeconomic status, Hyman found it useful to make a distinction between membership groups and reference groups when seeking to understand the means individuals use to place themselves in a social framework. Hyman noted that individuals picked individuals and groups of individuals for comparison.

Kelly (1947) elaborated the concept dividing reference groups into comparative and normative groups. Understanding in what manner a person used a reference group, Kelly argued, is essential to understanding whether the individual uses a particular group as one for self-appraisal or whether or to help form or change norms and opinions. While useful as a theoretical distinction the actual separation may not be so clear for a particular individual in a particular situation and may actually be "inextricably intertwined" (Jones and Gerard, 1967).

Newcomb re-evaluated his Bennington college study in terms of the reference group (1948). He claimed the understanding of comparative and normative groups helped him to explain some findings that previously appeared contradictory, saying that "membership in a group in which certain attitudes are approved (ie. held by majorities, and conspicuously so by leaders) individuals acquire the approved attitudes." Elsewhere Newcomb notes that as group members interact and talk among themselves, they feel rewarded when their attitudes coincide, and thus tend to influence one another to arrive at similar attitudes.

The Stouffer et al. book The American Soldier (1949) used a similar concept--relative deprivation--to explain why soldiers in a group that at first glance appeared to be a more favorable unit might be less satisfied with their positions than an individual in what appeared to be a less favorable unit. It was all a matter, they argued, of with whom one compares one's self.

Kelly (1955) and Shibutani (1968) echo Simmel when they discuss the interaction of group influence within the individual. Arguing that the individual uses the group's frame of reference because he aspires to "gain or maintain acceptance" in a group in which he desires to communicate.

The concept of referent power is particularly germane. French and Raven (1959) argue that the membership group has immediate and often harsh sanctions to maintain adherence to

the group norms, but the non-membership group can be even more powerful in control because of the individual's willing submission to the perceived group's norms. The most powerful combination is of course the membership group that is also a reference group.

The Primary Group

Cognitive consistency theories offer several explanations of the mechanisms of influence.

Heider's p-o-x theory (1946,1958) argues that the relationship among the three entities p,o and x seeks a "balanced" state.

Newcomb's A-B-X theory (1959,1961) speaks more directly to the actual "communicative act" assumed in Heider. Person A and person B each have an orientation to object or person X. "Coorientation" occurs to the extent that A and B are oriented toward each other and toward X at the same time and in the same context.

It would seem consistent that an individual (A) who saw a particular primary group (B) as a referent group for a certain group of norms or values (X) would tend to perceive that he or she had similar orientations toward those norms or values as other members of the group with whom he has (or has not) communicated.

The communication within groups was of prime importance to Katz and Lazarsfeld. In Personal Influence, their study based on in Decatur, Ill., they sought to "rediscover" the

primary group. Their "chief concern is...that [primary] groups actively influence and support most of an individual's opinions, attitudes and actions." They argued that interpersonal relationships served as "anchorage" points for individual opinions, habits and values.

> [I]nteracting individuals seem collectively and continuously to generate and to maintain common ideas and behavior patterns which they are reluctant to surrender or to modify unilaterally.

Further they noted that "interpersonal relationships imply networks of interpersonal communication," to which they tie to their concept of the two-step flow. One way to view the opinion leader concept would be primary group as reference group.

Several studies have found only limited support for the two-step flow (Troldahl 1966-67; Rosario,1971). But most of the were concerned with categorizing individuals as "leaders" or "followers," rather than trying to establish how the social-media relationship might function. But much of the inability to find support for the concept may be as a result of looking for the flow vertically rather than horizontally. Stated another way, the communication may be more likely to occur within social groups where the members are relatively homogeneous on a certain relevant attribute than between more heterogeneous groups.

Troldahl and Van Dam (1965,66) divided people into "Givers, Askers and Inactives." They noted no SES

differences among the three groups using a judgment of the prestige of wage earner's occupation. They did note that "Givers" had more formal education than either of the other groups, and the "Givers" did show higher levels of local public affairs knowledge (though there was no difference for national public affairs). A conclusion that one might inferred is that within a social group people tend to seek knowledge from those who are better educated or are known to have more knowledge. Which is a reasonable and efficient strategy to obtain new information or a contextualized, in the terms of the group, understanding of some information. Further, they found that three-fourths of the conversations included both "giving" and "asking" pointing toward the sharing of opinion.

The sharing of opinions among similar individuals was further supported by Arndt (1968). In a field experiment with married Harvard students he found unexpectly a large amount of word-of-mouth information flowing from "nonleaders to leaders." He argued that this sharing also added evaluations of the information at each communicative juncture.

Allen (1969) finds some support for the original notion that some knowledge of public affairs comes independently from social interactions. He argues that social relations function in two ways. First "as channels through which

communications are relayed." But secondly, and more importantly here,

> as sources of social pressures and social support that influence the decision-making process. These social sanctions also determine, in part, selective exposure, perception and retention of media content and thus the amount and quality of person influence and information that is transmitted.
>
> (emphasis added)

Allen notes that the two-step flow hypothesis assumes a causal model where social relations are antecedent to an "increment of information." Allen allows that individuals might get all their information from mass media and then seek out social relations in order to satisfy their public affairs interest, but he argues that "The amount of social relation is an indirect index to the likelihood that the relaying and sanctioning functions are operating to increase the level of information in the theoretically proposed ways."

In that public affairs information can easily flow within groups of people who have similar interests, goals and friends (Hero, 1959), it would seem consistent that these groups would also exchange media experiences, as Allen suggests, and share appropriate hierarchies for sources of information.

Media Effects

One of the dominant approaches to the study of mass media today is the uses and gratifications approach. This

approach outlined in Katz, Blumler and McQuail (1974) argues that an active audience seeks and attends to media for specific reasons. Blumler (1980) further argues that those reasons for individuals use of the media reduce to three basic purposes: 1) Cognitive orientation; 2) Diversion and; 3) Personal Identity. Speaking in terms of cognitive orientation he postulates that "cognitive motivation will facilitate information gain." Within this cognitive orientation one would expect to find not only the individual's desires to attend media to access information, but further one would expect the individual would have some strategy for attending <u>certain</u> media for <u>certain</u> information.

The mixture of media that a person uses would certainly have elements of "diversion" and "personal identity" represented within it. One would expect that using overall exposure patterns would often tend to mask the relationship between a particular message or medium and a particular effect. A particular gratification sought would likely have a particular strategy associated with it for expected realization. It is inefficient and unlikely that the individual seeks to realize a particular gratification at random. One does not just turn on the television at some random time to learn about the weather, or to see a soap opera, or to obtain some public affairs information. Nor would it do much good to pick up a public opinion

magazine to satisfy a desire to see a soap opera. The gratification, for an active audience, has some specific range of possibilities associated with it for the greatest likelihood of realization. Further if the reason for seeking satisfaction of a particular gratification has its roots in social group expectations for communication utility (Atkin, 1972; McLeod, Ward, and Tancil, 1965; Chaffee, Ward, and Tipton 1970) one would expect the social group to have expectations for the manner in which the gratification is satisfied (medium or media appropriate for "real" satisfaction).

If the overall exposure patterns probably reflect too many uses of media to point out specific effects, where would one expect to find evidence of the linkage between the seeking of a particular type of information and the source of that information, then one would need to establish the media pattern the individual perceives as most appropriate for satisfaction for his or her public affairs (or other type of) information. One concept has developed, it will be argued, that can be useful in viewing the individual's relevant social group's "appropriate" strategy for satisfaction of the individual's (and hence the group's) public affairs information needs. Too much information could be just as dysfunctional as too little.

Reliance

Media reliance is a concept that, while it has been fairly widely used, has not so clearly developed. Probably the major thrust for the discussion, if not the development, of the concept of reliance might be traced to the decline in political partisanship and voting during the 1960s that correlates with the rise of television as the medium most people report using most for their information (Roper, 1977; Ziemke and Luetscher, 1979). This covariance was noted, lamented and assumed causal by much of the popular press. The potential for political dysfunction of the mass media (read broadcast media), is not new. Radio was earlier seen by Larzarsfeld and Merton (1948) as providing a narcotising dysfunction.

Lang and Lang (1959) writing about the voting and the mass media speculated that "politics as drama" would lead to the distrust of the political system.

Lazarsfeld (1940) was probably the first to define the concept (though not too usefully) when he wrote that dependence is the "degree of dependence on a preferred news source" (emphasis added).

DeFleur and Ball-Rokeach (1976) gave the concept permanence and elaboration. Their "dependency theory" posits that dependency is is a social level concept that is a relationship established to satisfy the needs of an audience in its attainment of goals. Normally placed at a systems level, they define a society as dependent on mass

media to the extent that the satisfaction of needs and goals of some part of society are contingent on another part of society. While their intent appears to be primarily at a systems level, the applicability at the individual level is also evident. It is primarily at the individual level that the concept developed.

Robinson's (1975,1976) "videomalaise" certainly echoes the narcotising dysfunction of nearly two decades before. He uses the term to refer to the dangerous political side effects caused by too much television news watching. The term reliance comes from the manner in which it is measured. The Center for Political Studies has an item asking "Which [medium] do you rely on...." This nominal definition has largely stood in the literature. Other's have tried to equate this measurement with some measure of exposure with little success (Miller, Erbring and Goldenberg, 1979).

Miller and Reese (1980) found some support for the concept of reliance at least when considered in interaction with exposure to the reliant media.

McDonald (1983) posits one useful way to divide the reliance literature. He divided it between a perspective used by Becker and his associates and a perspective used by McLeod and his associates.

Becker sees individuals as dependent on media to varying degrees. The more exclusively one uses one medium

over others, the more dependent one is on that medium (usually read newspaper and television dependent). Becker builds an index of dependence which includes reliance on a given medium, exposure patterns and exclusivity of use and uses this index in a causal manner predicting political knowledge and affect.

McLeod sees reliance on a medium within a context of the satisfaction of specific needs. The effects of media are contingent upon the media relied upon for the specific need. Becker would expect to find effects of dependency "across the board," while McLeod would expect to find a qualitative difference between reliance groups for the specific purpose at hand--generally public affairs information.

McLeod and McDonald (1985) choose to refer to the "media orientations" of an individual rather than media dependency subsuming under it the more specific forms of communication activity: time spent, exposure to particular content, degree of reliance, level of attention and motivation for use. (emphasis added)

Their strategy is to examine each of the dimensions separately by medium, rather than attempting to combine all orientations into one single index (Becker and Whitney, 1980) that may mask effects of any particular orientation. While they found little predictive power for reliance, they did find support for Reese and Miller (1980) and McDonald

(1983) both of whom found evidence for the concept of reliance.

But the question remains as to what reliance means. In terms of the previous discussion McLeod and Chaffee (1972) offer a use of the word that has potential.

> Situational determination of reality seeking is the explanation offered by Jones and Gerard (1967). Rejecting Festinger's motivational drive for evaluation, they instead see the force coming from requirements for action within the social situation. The person needs to know the various courses of action and the probability of each. So he seeks information from the reliable source (rather than from the most familiar source, as Festinger would have it).
>
> (emphasis added)

This seeking of a reliable source for information within the individual's situational estimation of reality provides a usable link between group constraints and media use patterns. (see Appendix a for a more complete list of assumptions)

Summary

The individual perceives reality through his or her social interactions. It can be generally argued that groups that the individual uses for an example for how to view and proceed in a given situation influences the individual's pattern of attitudinal formation and behaviors. While the individual "gives" himself or herself to the norms and expectations of the reference group, thus allowing for the group to have influence on him or her, the groups to which the individual actually belongs have immediate and often

severe sanctions on the individual. When the primary group is also a reference group the constraints that the group imposes are the most powerful.

Communication is one primary expectation of the group for the individual. The group has expectations about what the individual should have knowledge about and further what level of complexity the information should be. The source of the information would be the vital link in the satisfaction of the group's expectations for the individual. In that most communication appears to be primarily sharing, which implies a horizonal rather than a vertical information flow, it would likely be most useful for the participants for the individuals to have similar levels of information thus facilitating sharing.

Information comes in different levels of complexity. The what and who of something being superseded by the how and why. Some sources of information would also better facilitate the group's communication patterns. If the group defines reality for the individual in particular situations and the group uses information primarily of one type then it seems consistent these sources would be most functional for the individual.

Media reliance for this study is the perceived primary medium prescribed by the individual's relevant social gorup for a particular type of information based on the individual's perception that the particular medium best

satisfies the group's (and thus the individual's in terms of the group's) quantitative and qualitative needs for the particular type of information.

CONCEPTUALIZATION

There are several reasons for defining reliance in terms of group expectations. The most prominent reason is its potential for clarifying the often incompatible findings of various studies that use the concept of media reliance. Secondly, it has potential for specifying a mechanism for the influence of demographic predictors of media use. Finally, an increase in the understanding of the antecedents of media exposure may allow for fuller understanding of the effects of that exposure.

The principal concepts of concern here are the primary group as reference group, and the expectations of the group for its members. The expectations are in terms of norms for 1) certain types of information, where for each type of information the expectations of group are for that information to be of a certain quality and quantity; and 2) the primary means to attain and maintain the appropriate level (quality and quantity) of information where the means are primarily mediated.

Group Influence

If the web of group influence on the individual is difficult to disentangle, as Simmel alludes and as Jones and

Gerard (1967) state, then probably the best place to begin to find evidence of influence is where it is likely to be the strongest. The primary group that is also a reference group, as French and Raven (1959) note, is in the position to exert the most influence. The primary group is defined as groups that are "usually characterized by their small size, relative durability, informality, face-to-face contact, and manifold" (Katz and Lazarsfeld, 1955). For this study primary group will be defined as any stable, over time, group of individuals with a common bond with which one has at least some face-to-face contact.

The reference group is a group that serves as a context for a given situation for the individual either for norms or comparison. They are "those groups to which the individual relates himself as part of or to which he aspires to relate himself psychologically" (Sherif, 1953). For this study the reference group is the group that one uses as a standard for one's self in a particular situation.

The reference group need not be a primary group. Riley and Riley (1959) noted:

> The reference group approach is not by definition limited to primary groups, but they seem to have the most compelling hold.

The primary group's ability to administer immediate and harsh sanctions combined with the individual's willing submission to the reference group's norms makes the influence of the primary group that is also a reference

group, as French and Raven (1959) note, the most powerful combination. For this study the group, in group influence, is defined as a primary group that also functions as a reference group. This group is defined as a stable, over time, body of individuals with a common bond, with which one has at least some face-to-face contact, and serves as a standard for the individual in a particular situation.

Expectations of Group

Under the assumption that an individual uses as group as a reference point to the extent that he or she wishes to communicate with members of the group (Shibutani, 1968), one can assume that the group has expectations of communication among group members.

If one assumes that interaction among group members generates and maintains "common ideas and behaviors" (Katz and Lazarsfeld, 1955) then it would seem consistent that certain types of ideas and behaviors are likely to be important to certain groups. New information about the important types of information is likely to be especially salient for the particular group. It will be need to be contextually evaluated within the group, as in the diffusion process where the adopter will seek interpersonal information to evaluate the new information (Rogers and Shoemaker, 1971). This communality of ideas and behaviors should allow for higher levels of coorientation within the

group then one might expect from two randomly chosen individuals.

Further it would seem likely that the degree of coorientation would be increased when the new information is of a level of complexity that is similar to the level already possessed by the group (Troldahl and Van Dam ,1965,66). Complexity will be defined as the level of quantity and quality of information available in the information channel.

The quantity and quality of information perceived available from different media has been heavily discussed in the popular literature. Sources of information can be seen as differing generally in their available quantity and quality of information.

News and opinion magazines such as Time, Newsweek, and The New Republic, probably more than any other mass medium, present not only a great many facts but also present a viewpoint, a context for a more complete presentation of the facts. Radio, on the other hand, generally presents fewer though usually more temporally salient bits of information. But its presentation has much less linkage between items (less context) than the magazine. All of the four primary media of concern here (magazines, newspapers, television and radio) have properties that make them different in kind from one another. This is not to criticize how the various media do their jobs. Television can cover certain stories such as

a fire much better than a newspaper. The visual capabilities of television can present a captivating story that would probably be relagated to a couple of paragraphs in the newspaper. A budget story or a story on the nuclear arms negociation, on the other hand, would be difficult to present in a video format where detail and explanation are at a premium. For this study quantity is the number of facts presented, and quality is the amount context (relevant linkage between presented facts) presented around the facts. Each source of information would have a particular combination of quantity and quality of information. While the video channel of information certainly contains valuable, complex information, it may also divert attention to the trivial in the news situation (what color dress Nancy Reagan was wearing) away from intended "purpose" of the story.

Study Design and Sample

This study is based on a cross-sectional sample survey of adults in Dane County, Wisconsin. The sample was a stratified proportionate probability sample of residential telephone lines in the county. The interviewing was done by advanced undergraduate, and graduate students as partial satisfaction of the requirements for a class on research methodology. The interviewing took place during the last

two weeks of October, 1984. All interviews were independently verified.

To develop a measurement to determine the individual's primary/referent group five items were submitted to principal factor analysis. The four factors that emerged are presented in Table 1. (See appendix b for question listing and further explanation.)

--Table 1 about here--

The individual's primary/referent group was determined by ranking the individual's standardized factored scores. The number one ranking group, of the four possible groups, was defined as the individual's primary/referent group.

Of the 737 respondents interviewed 33 had their own reliance or primary/reference group data missing. These were excluded from any further analysis leaving 704 as the working sample.

Three varieties of knowledge were considered: Issue knowledge (12 items, alpha = .72); Congress knowledge (10 items, alpha = .87); Foreign knowledge (4 items, alpha = .63).

The media use questions were all indices based on Likert scale questions. All of the measures are more fully described in Appendix c.

SES (Education and Income) and age were employed as demographic controls because both knowledge and group cohesiveness have been shown to to be related to each.

Hypotheses

If reliance is to some extent an indication of the perceived group expectations for media use for a certain type of information, then individuals should generally agree with their perceived primary/referent group's reliant medium.

H1. The individual and his or her group will show significantly greater agreement in media reliance than one would expect by chance.

While each respondent actually has six possible choices for each group and his or her own reliant medium, the literature predicts (at least for the respondent) that most often either television or newspapers are chosen. Setting a model of chance to test this hypothesis, then, with equal probabilities across all six categories would not be a fair test. Instead, a conditional probability would be a more conservative model of chance to test Hypothesis 1. For this study, the model of chance to test the first hypothesis would be the conditional probability of being reliant on a certain medium and perceiving the determined referent group's reliance to be the same. For example, if 50 percent of the total sample claims newspaper reliance, one would expect by chance that 50 percent of the referent groups' reliance to also be on newspapers. Thus the chance of one claiming newspaper reliance and perceiving one's referent

group's reliance as also being newspapers becomes (.5)*(.5) or .25. For this example, if significantly more than one in four of the respondents "match" their perceive reference groups reliance then support could be claimed for the first hypothesis for the newspaper reliant. For an overall test one would simply add all the conditional probabilities across the six possibilities to arrive at an overall model of chance. Where the final test is:

$$z = \frac{p-P}{\sqrt{\frac{P*Q}{N}}}$$

(Loether and McTavish, 1974)

For the remaining analysis at least four groups will be derived for comparison. At minimum there will be two newspaper reliant groups and two television reliant groups (other media reliant groups will be formed if the number of respondents allows). One of each medium will be those who conform with their derived referent group in the perception of media reliance. The other, for each medium, will be those who did not conform or "match" their derived referent group in the perception of media reliance. Stated another way, there will be two television reliant groups. One group whose referent group is also television reliant, and one group whose referent group is not television reliant.

If the group influence is for a medium that contains more complex information and reliance on a medium is related to the expectation of the group on level of knowledge for the individual, then individuals who perceive their referent group as expecting them to use a more complex information source and who claim reliance on that source should possess more knowledge than individuals whose referent group influence is for a medium that contains less complex information.

H2. Newspaper reliant people who perceive their referent group as newspaper reliant will possess more knowledge than newspaper reliant people who perceive their referent group as other than newspaper reliant.

H3. Newspaper reliant people who perceive their referent group as newspaper reliant will possess more knowledge than television reliant people whether the television reliant individuals perceive their referent group as television reliant or not.

If the perceived expectation of the group for the individual is for a less complex information and thus less complex source of information, then individuals who are congruent with their group's perceived reliant medium should possess the least knowledge.

H4. The television reliant individuals who perceive their reference group's reliant medium is television will possess less knowledge than the television reliant

individuals who perceive their reference group's reliant medium as other than television.

H5. The television reliant individuals who perceive their reference group's reliant medium is television will possess less knowledge than newspaper reliant individual's regardless of the newspaper reliant reference group's reliant medium.

There are at least three possibiilties why individuals did not match their group's reliant medium. The first is that an individual does not really have a primary/referent group for political information. And thus the proper referent group, assuming that everyone has one, has not been identified in this study. The second possibility is that referent groups might overlap to such an extent to make disentanglement difficult or impossible. Finally, an individual might be in the process of re-evaluation of their referent group for this type of information. Given these possibilities one would expect the individuals who did not see themselves as "matching" their referent group to fall between the individuals who felt congruent with their perception of their reference group's reliant medium in their levels of political knowledge, but reliance on a more complex media should predict higher knowledge.

H6. The newspaper reliant individuals who perceive their referent group's reliant medium as other than newspapers will hold more knowledge than the television

reliant individuals who perceive their referent group's reliant medium as other than television.

If the individual is able to perceive what his or her group expects in the way of information holding and can also perceive the "proper" method of satisfying those information expectations, then one would expect that the individual's satisfaction of the group's source for information should coincide with the satisfaction of the group's expectations for the level of information. If these group expectations for knowledge are directly related to the media the individual uses, then one would expect media variables would make a larger contribution to knowledge for those who rely on their group's reliant medium than for those who do not.

H7. The individuals who rely on their group's reliant medium will show larger contributions to knowledge for the media variables than will the individuals who did not match their group's reliant medium.

Hypothesis 7 will be tested using the R^2 from hierarchical multiple regression analysis run within each of the four groups described above for each of the three types of knowledge. In the first block will be entered socio-economic status and age as general demographic predicters. The second block will enter the more specific demographic predictors -- the group variables. Given that the content of concern here is political, the next block will contain general political interest. The fourth block

entered will contain the first media variables -- newspaper and television frequency of use. The fifth block will be specific television and newspaper content other than public affairs (Non-public affairs). The sixth and seventh blocks both pertain to public affairs content. The sixth attention to this type of content, and the seventh is public affairs content viewing.

The test of Hypothesis 7 will be a test of incremental R^2 of blocks 4-7 (McLeod, Glynn and McDonald, 1983).

Since an individual's media use for a particular type of information is linked to the expectation of a certain level of knowledge holding for the individual individuals who match reliant group's reliant medium should perceive that they hold a more similar level of knowledge to their referent group than do individuals who do not match their group's reliant medium.

RESULTS

Summary of the Problem

The problem is to conceptualize more clearly the concept of media reliance. This paper has argued that the reliance questions measure the perceived influences that converge upon the individual by social group(s) with which the individual wishes to be identified. To better investigate this phenomenon, the sample was broken into respondents who perceived that their derived

primary/referent group for political information was reliant on the same medium as themselves and into those who perceived that their group was reliant on some other medium.

Each of these groups was further broken into two more groups based on whether the respondent claimed to be television or newspaper reliant (Group 1 -- Self TV and Group TV; Group 2 -- Self TV and Group Not TV; Group 3 -- Self Newspaper and Group Not Newspaper; Group 4 -- Self Newspaper and Group Newspaper). This chapter will review the formal hypotheses and show whether the data supported each hypothesis. Further, additional analysis will be provided where appropriate.

While comparisons of means will provide the bulk of the evidence for hypothesis testing, multiple regression analyses should provide some further insights into the dynamics of the phenomenon.

Hypothesis 1 stated that there would be significantly greater agreement between the individual and the perceived group reliance than one would expect by chance. While the respondent actually had six possible choices for a reliant source, the literature suggests that most people would claim either television or newspaper reliance (McLeod and McDonald, 1985). Setting a model of chance, then, with equal probabilities across six categories would not be a fair test. Instead, a conditional probability would be a more conservative model by which to test Hypothesis 1.

In the sample 44 percent of the respondents said they were newspaper reliant, 36 percent said they were television reliant, and 20 percent claimed to be reliant on one of the other sources of information. The best prediction of the perceived reliance within the different groups would most likely follow the same patterns. A model of chance to test the first hypothesis would be the conditional probability of being reliant on a certain medium and perceiving your group's reliance to be the same. Thus, the joint probability of being newspaper reliant and having the individual's primary/referent group reliant medium being newspapers is (.44)*(.44) or .19. Similarly, for television it would be (.36)*(.36) or .13. And finally, the other sources (.20)*(.20) or .04.

Of the 737 respondents 660 of them had a score for reliance and at least some data on one or more group. The 660 were retained for further analysis. Overall, one would expect by chance 36 percent of the individual and group reliance would be the same by chance (.19)+(.13)+(.04). In the sample 55 percent were correctly matched. The 19 percent difference is significant at a probability beyond .01.

A similar pattern emerged examining within source. For newspapers 19 percent should match by chance, but 30 percent were actually matched ($p < .01$). Similarly, for television 13 percent matching was predicted and 21 percent actually

were matched ($p < .01$). For the Other source groups only 2 percent were actually matched, while 4 percent were predicted. For this group the prediction did not hold. This, however, is a grouping of four sources with relatively few in each category and may act as a confound for prediction. When only the respondents who claimed television or newspaper reliance were examined the prediction was somewhat better (newspaper 55 percent predicted, 69 percent actual; television 45 percent predicted, 59 percent actual). Hypothesis 1 then has support in the data.

Because of the small number of respondents who claimed reliance on media other than television or newspapers (total of 99) looking at media such as magazines or radio is not feasible. Further, looking at these other media in an aggregated form would likely severely confound any results and make findings dubious at best. Therefore, the remaining analysis will have a total N of 561. There are 311 newspaper reliant (213 matching their group; 98 not matching) and 250 television reliant (148 matching; 102 not matching).

Looking within groups also showed support for the first hypothesis. The proportion of agreement on a reliant medium between the respondent and the derived referent group was higher in all four cases than was the proportion of agreement between a respondent and a group that was not his

or her derived referent group. Those who had family for their group agreed 68.6 percent of the time with their family's reliant medium, while those who did not have their family as their derived social group agreed 53.8 percent of the time ($p \leq .01$). A similar pattern held for the other three groups. Respondents who had workers as their referent group matched their group's reliant medium 56.1 percent of the time, while those who had another group matched workers 48.4 percent ($p \leq .05$). Finally, those who had an Admirer group matched 52.8 percent and 46.2 percent (n.s.) and those whose group was Friends had 56 percent and 49.9 percent (n.s.). The average difference across the four groups was 8.85 ($p \leq .05$).

Hypotheses 2-6 predicted the order of knowledge holding for the four groups. The newspaper reliant individuals who perceive their primary/referent group's reliance matches their own will possess more knowledge than newspaper reliant individuals who perceive their primary/referent group's reliance as other than newspaper. This unmatched newspaper group will in turn possess more knowledge than the unmatched television group. Finally, the matched television group was predicted to hold the least amount of knowledge.

Table 2 presents the means, standard deviations and t-tests for the television and newspaper reliant respondents who matched their group's reliance and also the television and newspaper reliant respondents who did not match their

group's reliant source. The table does show support for these hypotheses, but what is of most interest here is the comparison of the reliant groups that Matched with the Unmatched reliant groups.

The matched television reliant group shows the least knowledge in all three knowledge categories (-.22, -.32, -.27), followed by the television unmatched group (-.06, -.19, -.08), the unmatched newspaper group (.05, -.03, .01) and finally the matched newspaper group (.16, .33, .22). The most variation occurs within knowledge of the congress, and the least variation within knowledge of issue position of the two presidential candidates.

Some other comparisons are especially noteworthy here. First, the newspaper and television exposure variables show little difference within media (N/N or T/T), and the variation between media (M/M or U/U) is largely what one would expect from previous research findings. Further, the newspaper reliant who match their perceived group reliance show the highest level political interest(.22), with the unmatched newspaper reliant a distant second (.03), and the two television reliant groups trailing (-.18, -.23). But perhaps of most interest for the arguments of this study are the comparisons among the demographic variables. The matched newspaper group has the highest socioeconomic score (.20) and the matched television has the lowest (-.25).

This may suggest that socio-economic status is an alternative explanation for the phenomenon.

If one accepts the theoretical perspective here, there are at least two reasons for the inability to match the respondent and their primary/referent group. The first is that the respondent does not use any of the primary groups as a referent group. They likely have some referent group for this type of information, but it is not a group of which they are an actual member. Second, it is also possible that the mixture -- web of influence -- is inseparable. One example would be individuals who are in the process of changing their referent group for this type of information. The SES scores for the two unmatched groups fall between the two matched groups. Further the unmatched newspaper reliant group is the youngest and probably composed of many respondents who are re-evaluating the influences in their lives as they move from an ascribed social status to an achieved position.

To help sort out the SES effects and for further illustration Table 3 presents the raw means, standard deviations and means adjusted for SES and age. Here one should note that the ordering remains unchanged with the adjusted means showing only modest differences. While one still finds significant differences between the matched newspapers and the matched television (the projected high

and low), no longer do most of the other pairwise comparisons remain significantly different.

As a final test of the predictions here a trend analysis was performed. For this test each individual of the test groups was assigned a score based on the 2x2 cell he or she fell into. Matched Newspaper respondents were given a 4; unmatched newspapers were given a 3; unmatched television a 2; and matched television a 1. Each was assigned based on the predicted relative level of knowledge holding. This new variable was then entered into a hierarchical regression analysis. Each type of knowledge was regressed on a first block of SES and age. Then this new variable was entered as a test of linearity. To test for any quadratic and cubic components, the square and cube of the new variable were separately and subsequently entered. All three regressions showed significant linear components ($p \leq .01$). There was no significant contribution for for either the quadratic or cubic functions for any of the three regressions. This further supports the predicted ordered (linear in this case) nature of the relationship.

Hypothesis 7 says that the matched groups will show greater contributions to knowledge for media variables than will the unmatched groups.

Hypothesis 7 has some support. Comparing Tables 4 and 5; Tables 6 and 7; and Tables 8 and 9 (matched and unmatched at different types of knowledge), one notes that for the

unmatched respondents only Congress knowledge for the television group (Table 6) shows a significant contribution for media. While some of the reason for non-significance for issue knowledge may be due to smaller sample size, the lack of contribution to congressional and foreign knowledge for media variables is consistent with the hypothesis.

Using a test of the differences of R^2 within knowledge type and medium provide some additional evidence. Three of the six comparisons are significant. While there are non-significant differences within Issue Knowledge (10.98 vs 10.82 and 7.42 vs 8.75) and for the television comparison within Foreign Knowledge, there are significant differences for both media within Congress Knowledge and between newspaper groups for Foreign Knowledge ($p \leq .05$).

Further, one notes consistent patterns for the matched groups. For the newspaper reliant one finds significant contributions for specific content types (public affairs and non-public affairs) but not for overall frequency. For the matched television group, however, one finds significant contributions for overall frequency and not for specific content (except for public affairs use within Congress knowledge). One could argue that expectation levels for this matched newspaper group are of such that frequency of media use may be less important than using primarily public affairs media (and not other types of content). For the matched television group the expectation for information may

be lower and hence the regular use of media is sufficient to account for the needed knowledge levels.

The inability of the attention variables to make any significant contribution to these knowledge variables for either the matched or unmatched respondents and helps substantiate the above analysis.

A closer examination of the regression equations is worthwhile here. The group variables overall show significant contributions for group influence for all types of knowledge. This may be a reasonable demonstration of the need to take into account antecedent factors of media use. Next, one might note that while all of the total variance accounted for by the equations is relatively high (from 20.01-38.87) the unmatched groups generally have considerably lower adjusted total variances, with neither of the equations for foreign knowledge showing significance at $p \leq .05$. Further, and arguably more interesting, the unmatched groups' variance is associated with social antecedents with little (and almost no significant) amount of explained variance associated with the media predictors (as discussed earlier). Thus media has its greatest influence for individuals whose reliance is congruent with their primary/referent group. It would seem consistent, at least from a uses and gratifications approach, to surmise that these persons who have a discernible (at least from this study's perspective) primary/referent group approach

media in a more purposeful manner and are thus discernibly affected by the media they use.

One explanation of these findings might argue that the unmatched groups without that congruent referent group may have a less directed, more idiosyncratic approach to their use of the mass media. If one combines these findings with the differences in SES means (where the unmatched groups fall between the high matched newspaper reliant and the low matched television reliant), then one could argue that these respondents probably find themselves within a social web comprising elements of relatively equal influence. Further these elements -- social influence -- are more dissimilar than similar. The matched groups, according to this argument, would have either a dominant influence group or be positioned within a web of elements of relatively similar influence.

CONCLUSIONS

This intial study using small group preditors to define reliance has had some success. First, it does appear to improve the prediction an individual's media reliance by knowing something about the perceived media patterns of the people around him or her. Socialization factors certainly need to be further examined in relation to media habits, and not only adolescent socialization. We are continually socialized throughout our lives as we change roles,

lifestyles, jobs or just grow older. Whether we like to admit it or not other people affect all of us. Understanding that influence could help our understanding of media use and effect significantly.

This study has also helped to untangle, at least to some extent, the concept of media reliance. Much of the research in the this area has tried to tie reliance to dependency theory. It seems that this might be problematic. The powerfulness of a medium or of the media in general may be mute in a information rich society such as ours. Given interest of a level sufficient to warrant expenditure of time or money, a person in western societies of modest education can gather much of the information available on a given topic. Given this assumption, a person's motivations become the governing factor, and it is the genesis of these motivations that bear exploration. This framework does move reliance somewhat more into the realm of uses and gratifications, at least to the extent that one's motivations for use and degree of gratification can be traced to social origins.

The examination of subgroups within this study also helped separate the effects involved with media reliance. For example, if the differences between the four groups had shown the two newspaper groups showing similar levels of knowledge and significantly larger levels of knowledge than the two television group than one would argue that it was

reliance on a particular medium that was the controlling effect. Many have so argued that reliance on newspapers leads to greater levels of knowledge (relative to television), but the data here revealed differentiation between the newspaper groups. It remains conceivable that the newspaper reliant do, at least on average, have more knowledge than do the television reliant, but part of the reason -- maybe even a large part -- has to do with the motivations for using the newspaper in the first place rather than primarily with the medium itself.

Another alternative explanation that these data explore is that this difference is primarily one of social relationships within the groups with homogenious reliance patterns. If this had been the case, then one would expect that the matched groups would have higher levels of knowledge than the unmatched groups. This also was not the case. Even after controls for SES and age (demographic variables that often account for signficant knowledge variance) the predicted ordering of the cells remained.

The third explanation, and the one developed here, remains credible. The expectation of communication would provide the motivation for the media use and information holding patterns evident here. The different contributions of media variables to knowledge adds further credence. The lack of difference between the matched and unmatched for issue knowledge needs addressing. One possible explanation

is that the issues involved were high profile issues (e.g. Abortion, Taxes). These sorts of issues may be largely too obtrusive to be avoided by most people, invading the space of even those mostly uninterested in political affairs. Another explanation could be the very nature of the candidates. This election, unlike many others, presented the public with candidates who were presented (and probably were) diametrically opposed. Not only did they clearly differ on most every issue, but, and perhaps more importantly, they differed in ideological terms. Given those distinct ideological positions one does not need to closely survey the media to guess where Reagan might stand on building nuclear weapons or public prayer in schools, or for them to guess that Mondale would take the opposite position.

This explanation also helps explain some of the conflicting findings in previous research. For example, some researchers were concerned about whether individuals were exclusively reliant (dependent) on one medium. One manner of dealing with this probllem was to exclude individuals who chose both television and newspapers rather than only one. But if one considers this within the context of this study, the probability is that those excluded were individuals would be more similar to the unmatched groups. Individuals, for example, who have no identifiable referent group for political knowledge, or whose web of influence

is more complex. If these people were mostly the ones excluded, then, according to the findings here, it would tend to provide the enhanced differences between the television and newspaper reliant that these studies presented.

The small group explanation also allows the differences in actual exposure patterns reported by respondents. Certainly one would expect to find reliance and exposure to be related, (and they are here) but if reliance is related primarily to motivations, then actual exposure patterns will be mixed among various media.

The explanation presented here also may help to resolve the problem of the other problems and inconsistencies in the reliance/dependence literature such as the problems of low efficacy among the television reliant. But it is the approach here that is probably more important than the findings themselves. This is a receiver oriented model. The previous research has primarily been sender oriented. The sender oriented assumes effects from exposure, and if exposure patterns could somehow be changed the effects would also change (usually translated as get people to read more, and watch less). To some extent this may be the case. Certainly if one could motivate individuals to spend an hour a day with a newspaper, they would probably hold more information. But again the key here is the motivation. If one could somehow begin to motivate an individual to read

more, then, by the very definition here, one has begun to change the influence web of the individual. The effects of exposure follow motiviation.

References

Allen,Irving "Social Relations in the Two-Step Flow: a Defense of the Tradition," Journalism Quarterly, Vol. 46:492-498, 1969.

Arndt, Johan, "A Test of the Two-Step Flow in Diffusion of a New Product," Journalism Quarterly, Vol. 45, No. 3, Autumn 1968.

Atkin, Charles, "Anticipated Communication and Mass Media Information-Seeking," Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 36:188-99, 1972.

Becker, Lee and Charles Whitney, "Effect of of media dependencies on audience assessment of government," Communication Research, Vol. 7:95-120, 1980.

Blumler, Jay, "The Role of Theory in Uses and Gratifications Studies," Communication Research, Vol 6:9-36, 1979.

Bostian, Lloyd, "The Two-Step Flow Theory: Cross-Cultural Implications," Journalism Quarterly, Vol. 47, No. 1, Spring 1970.

Chaffee, Steven, Scot Ward and Leonard Tipton, "Mass Communication and Political Socialization," Journalism Quarterly, Vol. 47: 647-59, 1970.

DeFleur, Melvin and Sandra Ball-Rokeach, Theories of Mass Communication, (New York: John Wiley), 1975.

French, John and Bertram Raven, "The Bases of Social Power," in Dorwin Cartwright (ed.), Studies in Social Power, (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press), 1959.

Heider, F., The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations, (New York: Wiley), 1958.

Heider, F. "Attitudes and cognitive organization," Journal of Psychology, Vol. 21:107-112, 1946.

Hero, A.O., Opinion Leaders in American Communities: Studies in Citizen Participation in International Relations, Vol VI (Boston: World Peace Foundation), 1959.

Hyman, Herbert, "Psychology of Status," Archives of Psychology, No. 269, 1942.

Jones, E.E., and H.B. Gerard, Foundations of Social Psychology, (New York: Wiley), 1967.

Katz, Elihu , Jay Blumler and Denis McQuail, "Utilization of Mass Communication by the Individual," Public Opinion Quarterly,Vol. 38, 1974.

Katz, Elihu and Paul Lazarsfeld, Personal Influence, (Glencoe, Ill. The Free Press), 1955.

Kelly, Harold, "Two Functions of Reference Groups," in Swanson, Guy and T.M. Newcomb (eds.) Readings in Social Psychology, 1947.

Kelly, Harold, "Salience of Membership and Resistance to Change of Group-Anchored Attitudes," in H. Hyman and E. Singer (eds.) Readings in Reference Group Theory and Research, (New York: The Free Press), 1968.

Lang, Kurt and Gladys Lang "Mass Media and Voting," in Eugene Burdick and Arthur J. Brodbeck, (eds.) American Voting Behavior, (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press), 1959.

Lazarsfeld, Paul, Radio and the Printed Page, (New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce), 1940.

Lazarsfeld, Paul and Robert Merton "Mass Communication, Popular Taste, and Organized Social Action," in L. Bryson (ed.) The Communication of Ideas, (New York: Institute for Religious and Social Studies), 1948.

Loether, Herman, and Donald McTavish, Inferential Statistics for Sociologists, (Boston: Allyn and Bacon) 1974.

McDonald, Daniel, "Investigating Assumption of Media Dependency Research," Communication Research, Vol. 10:509-528, 1983.

McLeod, Jack and Steven Chaffee, "The Construction of Social Reality," in J. Tedesche (ed.) The Social Influence Process, (Chicago: Aldine Atherton), 1972.

McLeod, Jack, Carroll Glynn and Daniel McDonald, "Issues and Images: The Influences of media reliance in voting decisions." Communication Research, Vol. 10:37-58.

McLeod, Jack and Daniel McDonald, "Beyond Simple Exposure: Media Orientations and Their Impact on Political Processes," Communication Research, Vol. 12: 3-33, 1985.

McLeod, Jack, Scott Ward and Karen Tancil, "Alienation and Uses of Mass Media," Public Opinion Quarterly Vol. 29:583-94, Winter 1965-66.

Meadowcroft, Jeanne and Dan McDonald "A History of Research on

Children and the Mass Media: An Empirical Investigation," Paper presented to the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Corvallis, Oregon, 1983.

Miller, M.Mark and Stephan Reese, "Media Dependency as Interaction: Effects of Exposure and Reliance on Political Activity and Efficacy," Communication Research, Vol. 9:227-248, 1980.

Miller, Arthur, E.N. Goldenberg and L.Erbring, "Type-set politics: Impact of Newspaper on Public Confidence," American Political Science Review, Vol. 73:67-78, 1979.

Newcomb, T.M., "Attitude Development as Function of Reference Groups: The Bennington Study," in E. Maccoby, T.M. Newcomb, and E.L. Hartley (eds.), Readings in Social Psychology, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.), 1958.

Newcomb, T.M., "Individual systems of Orientation," in S. Koch (ed.) Psychology: A study of a science, (New York: McGraw-Hill), 1959.

Newcomb, T.M., Social Psychology, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc.) 1961.

Reese, Stephan and M.Mark Miller, "Political Attitude Holding and Structure: Effects of Newspaper and Television News Exposure," Communcation Research, Vol. 8: 167-87, 1980.

Riley, J.W., Jr. and M.W. Riley "Mass Communication and the Social System," in Sociology Today: Problems and Prospects, R.K. Merton L. Broom and L.S. Cottrell, Jr. (eds.) (New York: Basic Books), 1959.

Robinson, Michael, "Public Affairs Television and the Growth of Political Malaise: 'The Case of the Selling of the Pentagon,'" American Political Science Review, Vol. 70:409-432, 1976.

Robinson, Michael, "American Political Legitimacy in an Era of Electronic Journalism: Reflections on the Evening News," in D. Cater and R. Adler (eds.) Television as a Social Force: New Approaches to TV Criticism, (New York: Praeger), 1975.

Rogers Evertte and Floyd Shoemaker Communication of Innovation, (New York: Free Press), 1971.

Roper Organization, Changing Attitudes Toward Television and Other Mass Media 1959-76, (New York: Television Information Office), 1977.

Sherif, Muzafer, "The Concept of Reference Groups in Human Relations," in M. Sherif and M.O. Wilson (eds.), Group Relations at the Crossroads, (New York: Harper and Row), 1953.

Shibutani, Tamotsu, "Reference Groups as Perspectives," in H.Hyman and E. Singer (eds.) Readings in Reference Group Theory and Research, (New York: The Free Press), 1968.

Simmel, Georg, The Web of Group Affiliations, (Glencoe,Ill: The Free Press), 1955.

Simmel, Georg, Conflict, (Glencoe, Ill: The Free Press), 1955.

Stouffer, Samuel, E.A. Suchman, L.C. DeVinney, S.A. Star and R.M. Williams Jr., The American Soldier Vol. 1: Adjustment During Army Life, (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press), 1949.

Troldahl, Verling, "A Field Test of a Modified 'Two-Step Flow of Communication' Model," Public Opinion Quarterly, 30:609-23, 1966-67.

Troldahl, Verling, and Robert Van Dam "Face-to-Face Communication about Major Topics in the News," Public Opinion Quarterly Vol. 29:626-34, Winter 1965.

Ziemke, Dean and William Luetscher, "A Cohort Analysis of Partisanship Decline and Television Dependence," A paper presented to the Association for Education in Journalism, Houston, Texas, 1979.

Appendix a

Theoretical Basis for Model of Reliance

Assumption 1 Many of the ideas, attitudes and behaviors of an individual are influenced by the groups to which the individual belongs or to which the individual aspires (Newcomb,1948).

Assumption 2 Groups place demands on the individual to attain and maintain group membership, and the individual perceives these demands and reacts accordingly based on the importance of the prominence and presence of the group in a relevant situation (Kelly, 1955).

Assumption 3 Although, many of the expectations that the group has for the individual are not directly related to the purpose of the group, an individual in a particular situation uses a relevant group as a frame of reference to gain or maintain acceptance in a group in which the individual desires to communicate. (Shibutani,1968)

Assumption 4 Communication between individuals occurs to the extent that the individuals attempting to communicate are simultaneously cooriented toward the object of communication (Newcomb, 1953).

Assumption 5 The chances of coorientation are increased when the individuals desiring communication possess knowledge about the object of communication that is similar. Further, individuals using similar sources of information have a greater likelihood of coorientation.

Assumption 6 Information and the sources of information have a particular quality and quantity of information (Wade and Schramm, 1969).

Assumption 7 Individuals who attempt to communicate can to some degree perceive the other's source of a particular type of information (Arndt, 1968).

Assumption 8 A group will tend to communicate about a particular type of information at a certain level of complexity (quantity and quality of information) (Allen, 1969).

Assumption 9 While the one may not necessarily consciously perceive that he or she is seeking communicable information, an individual who desires to communicate with members of a group will seek out information that is potentially useful for communication (Shibutani).

Assumption 10 Interaction between the individual and the group will be most rewarding when the interaction is between similar interactors (Newcomb, 1956), such that information of substantially greater or lesser complexity will be dysfunctional for the individual in terms of the relevant group.

Assumption 11 The individual will seek to maximize coorientation within the relevant group.

Theoretical Statement 1 If the individual uses sources of information generally compatible with the relevant group the individual will perceive that he or she possesses similar levels of information as other members of the relevant group.

Theoretical Statement 2 If the individual uses sources of information that are generally more or less complex than the relevant group then the individual will perceive that he or she possesses more or less information than the relevant group.

Theoretical Statement 3 If the individual's relevant group has high salience for a particular type of information the individual will hold higher levels of that information than other individuals.

Theoretical Statement 4 If the individual's relevant group uses more complex information sources and has high salience for a particular type of information the individual will hold the highest levels of that type of information than other individuals.

Appendix b

(Discussion) a. We would like to know how often you discuss politics with others. Again, on a one to ten scale, where one is Never discuss politics and 10 is discuss politics VERY OFTEN, how often do you discuss politics with: **your family**; **your friends**; (if appropriate) **people you work with**; and (if appropriate) **the people you admire**.

(Care about Knowledge) b. On a one to ten scale, where one is NOT AT ALL and ten is VERY MUCH, how much would you say that [**your family**; **your friends**; (if appropriate) **people you work with**; (if appropriate) **the people you admire**] cares about how much you know about politics?

(General Interest) c. We would like to know, in general, how interested you are in politics. On a one to ten scale, where one is NOT AT ALL interested and ten is VERY INTERESTED, how interested are [**you**; **your family**; **your friends**; (if appropriate) **the people you work with**; (if appropriate) **the people you admire**] in politics?

(Campaign Interest) d. How about in this political campaign, if one is NOT AT ALL INTERESTED and ten is VERY INTERESTED, how interested are [**you**; **your family**; **your friends**; (if appropriate) **the people you work with**; (if appropriate) **the people you admire**] in this political campaign?

(View Similarity) e. On that same one to ten scale, where one is VERY DISSIMILAR and ten is VERY SIMILAR, how dissimilar or similar are your political views to: **your family**; **your friends**; (if appropriate) **people you work with**; (if appropriate) **the people you admire**.

Individuals were screened for whether they worked and for whether they had a "person or group of people that you look up to most as a model for how to live your life." If they individual did not have such a group with which the come "into face-to-face contact" they were not asked any further questions about the people you admire. Similarly if they did not work outside of the home they were not asked any further questions about the people they worked with. All respondents were asked about family and friends. Each individual was then given a score on each factor using a factor score coefficient method.

Reliance for both the individual and the perceived reliance for the group was measured using the following question:

a. People get their political information from different sources. Please tell us which source you use most for information on current events and political affairs. Would you say that you use NEWSPAPERS, FAMILY AND FRIENDS, TELEVISION, MAGAZINES, RADIO or some OTHER source for most of your current events and political affairs information? [Respondent ranks at least top three]

b. How about your [**family**; **friends**; **the people you work**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

with; the people you admire]. Which source would they use most for information on currents events and political information?

c. What do you think their second choice would be?

Individuals were considered reliant on the medium they chose as the source they used most (ranked first). Similarly, the perceived reliance of the group was established by the medium they were perceived as using most (ranked first).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix c

Reliability

Issue Knowledge alpha = .72 (12 items)

Stances on Issues

Reagan:	Mondale:
ERA	ERA
Deficit	Deficit
Taxes	Taxes
Abortion	Abortion
School Prayer	School Prayer
Nuclear Weapons	Nuclear Weapons

Congress Knowledge alpha = .87 (10 items)

Naming:

Senator	Party
Senator	Party
Representative	Party
Representative's Opponent	Party

Length of term:

Senator
Representative

Foreign Knowledge alpha = .63 (4 items)

Naming:

President of Soviet Union
Capital of Nicaragua
Two countries that border Lebanon

Public Affairs Newspaper alpha = .63 (4 items)

How often do you read (FREQUENTLY, SOMETIMES, RARELY or NEVER):

International News
National Affairs News
Editorials
Local Affairs News

Non-Public Affairs Newspaper alpha = .44 (3 items)

How often do you read (FREQUENTLY, SOMETIMES, RARELY or NEVER):

Crime and accidents
Feature stories
Advertising

Attention to Newspapers alpha = .73 (5 items)

When you read the following kinds of stories how much attention do you pay to them (CLOSE ATTENTION, SOME ATTENTION, LITTLE ATTENTION):

National government and Politics
The presidential campaign
Local government and politics
Political ads
Political polls

Public Affairs Television alpha = .50 (3 items)

How often do you watch (FREQUENTLY, SOMETIMES, RARELY or NEVER):

National news
Local news
Magazine shows and Documentaries

Non-Public Affairs Television alpha = .50 (3 items)

How often do you watch (FREQUENTLY, SOMETIMES, RARELY or NEVER):

Crime and adventure shows
Situation comedies
Movies

Attention to Television alpha = .69 (5 items)

When you see these on televison, how much attention do you pay to them (CLOSE ATTENTION, SOME ATTENTION, LITTLE ATTENTION):

National government and politics
The presidential campaign
Local government and politics
Political ads
Political polls

Table 1

Principal Factor Analysis of Group Variables

Admirer				
Discussion	**.89**	.04	.09	.15
Care about Knowledge	**.91**	.03	.11	.13
General Interest	**.94**	.03	.07	.12
Campaign Interest	**.91**	.04	.07	.10
View Similarity	**.91**	.04	.06	.07
Worker				
Discussion	.03	**.83**	.04	.24
Care about Knowledge	.02	**.81**	.07	.22
General Interest	.05	**.90**	.04	.16
Campaign Interest	.06	**.88**	.08	.17
View Similarity	.02	**.80**	.02	.17
Family				
Discussion	.10	.08	**.66**	.29
Care about Knowledge	.07	.02	**.71**	.26
General Interest	.09	.04	**.79**	.21
Campaign Interest	.08	.06	**.82**	.23
View Similarity	.03	.02	**.58**	.03
Friend				
Discussion	.13	.21	.19	**.68**
Care about Knowledge	.07	.17	.26	**.66**
General Interest	.14	.20	.19	**.74**
Campaign Interest	.14	.22	.20	**.70**
View Similarity	.09	.19	.17	**.53**

Table 2

Standardized Means and t-tests for the Matched and Unmatched Television and Newspaper Reliant Groups

	Matched Groups			Unmatched Groups				
	R 's Reliance			R's Reliance				
	News.	TV		News.	TV			
Knowledge			M/M			U/U	N/N	T/T
Issue	.16	-.22	a	.05	-.06			b
Congress	.33	-.32	a	-.03	-.19	b	a	b
Foreign	.22	-.27	a	.01	-.08			
Groups								
Family	.11	-.04		-.10	-.07			
Worker	.10	-.11	b	-.13	.07			
Admirer	.00	-.09		-.01	.14			
Friend	.03	-.09		.23	-.16	a		
Newspapers								
Public Affairs	.29	-.37	a	.20	-.30	a		
Attention	.25	-.32	a	.14	-.22	a		
Non-Public Affairs	.02	.02		.03	-.12			
Frequency	.34	-.43	a	.16	-.25	a	b	
Television								
Public Affairs	-.05	.04		-.06	.08			
Attention	.25	-.32	a	.04	-.22		b	
Non-Public Affairs	-.06	.17	a	.08	.01		b	
Frequency	-.22	.26	a	-.09	.16	b		
Political Interest	.22	-.18	a	.03	-.23	a		
Demographics								
SES	.20	-.25	a	.03	-.02	a	a	b
Age	.03	.15	a	-.36	.05	a	a	

a = $p \leq .01$
b = $p \leq .05$

Newspaper Reliant/Matched n = 213
Television Reliant/Matched n = 148
Newspaper Reliant/Unmatched n = 98
Television Reliant/Unmatched n = 102

Bracketed items represent columns of two-tailed t-tests
For example: T/T is means test for the two television groups.
U/U is means test for the unmatched groups.

Table 3

Political Knowledge
Standardized Means, Standard Deviations and Adjusted Means and t-tests for the Matched and Unmatched Television and Newspaper Reliant Groups

	Matched Groups			Unmatched Groups				
	R's Reliance News.	R's Reliance TV	M/M	R's Reliance News.	R's Reliance TV	U/U	N/N	T/T
Issue Knowledge								
Mean	8.50	7.39	a	8.15	7.84		b	b
Std Dev	2.50	3.05		3.08	2.90			
N	213	148		98	102			
Congress Knowledge								
Mean	12.20	8.51	a	10.15	9.29	b	a	b
Std Dev	5.60	5.66		6.01	5.49			
N	213	148		98	102			
Foreign Knowledge								
Mean	1.65	.99	a	1.37	1.25		b	b
Std Dev	1.47	1.26		1.30	1.34			
N	213	148		98	102			
Total Knowledge	22.35	16.89		19.67	18.38			
Adjusted for SES and Age								
Issue Knowledge	8.30	7.41	a	8.04	7.75			
Congress Knowledge	10.07	6.64	a	8.14	7.41		a	
Foreign Knowledge	1.44	.85	a	1.18	1.08			
Total Adj. Knowledge	19.81	14.90		17.36	16.24			
difference Total-Total Adj.	-2.54	-1.89		-2.31	-2.14			

a = p < .01
b = p < .05

Bracketed items represent columns of one-tailed t-tests
For example: [T/T] is means test for the two television groups.
[U/U] is means test for the unmatched groups.

Table 4

Correlation, Partial Correlation and Incremental R^2 for the Matched Reliance Groups for Issue Knowledge

	Newspaper Reliant			Television Reliant		
	Simple r	Partial r	Incre. R^2	Simple r	Partial r	Incre. R^2
SES	.08	.03		.30	.16	
Age	-.08	-.10	1.44	-.09	-.05	8.99[a]
Groups						
Family	-.02	.00		.26	.03	
Worker	.10	.07		.17	.08	
Admirer	.11	.09		.19	.14	
Friend	.22	.16	6.76[a]	.09	-.01	8.33[a]
Political Interest	.18	.04	.84	.39	.21	5.32[a]
Frequency						
Newspapers	.02	-.01		-.05	-.10	
Television	-.15	-.04	1.21	-.23	-.17	4.36[b]
Non-Public Affairs						
Newspapers	-.21	-.13		-.07	-.05	
Television	-.19	-.12	3.53[b]	-.23	-.16	1.82
Attention						
Newspapers	.03	-.05		.23	.01	
Television	.05	-.07	.65	.23	-.00	.16
Public Affairs						
Newspapers	.24	.25		.25	.01	
Television	-.03	-.01	5.59[a]	.10	.12	1.08
Media R^2	10.98				7.42	
Total R^2	20.01[a]			Total R^2	29.91[a]	
Adjusted	13.38			Adjusted	21.22	
n=213				n=148		

a = $p \leq .01$
b = $p \leq .05$

Table 5

Correlation, Partial Correlation and Incremental R^2 for the Unmatched Reliance Groups for Issue Knowledge

	Newspaper Reliant			Television Reliant		
	Simple r	Partial r	Incre. R^2	Simple r	Partial r	Incre. R^2
SES	.39	.37		.35	.35	
Age	-.23	-.28	19.76[a]	-.18	-.19	14.65[a]
Groups						
Family	.11	-.13		.18	.07	
Worker	.09	-.08		-.04	-.12	
Admirer	.10	.04		.17	.14	
Friend	.17	-.01	2.14	.27	.19	9.02[b]
Political Interest	.27	.20	3.89[b]	.18	-.04	.47
Frequency						
Newspapers	-.03	-.07		-.08	-.09	
Television	.03	.18	.78	-.08	.10	1.63
Non-Public Affairs						
Newspapers	-.20	-.06		-.14	-.18	
Television	-.17	-.24	3.97	.01	.07	.89
Attention						
Newspapers	.27	.20		.01	-.12	
Television	.25	.02	4.49	.10	-.07	1.54
Public Affairs						
Newspapers	.09	-.15		.22	.25	
Television	-.05	-.03	1.58	.07	-.03	4.69
Media R^2	10.82			Media R^2	8.75	
Total R^2	36.61[a]			Total R^2	32.89[a]	
Adjusted	23.02			Adjusted	19.82	
n=98				n=102		

a = $p \leq .01$
b = $p \leq .05$

Table 6

Correlation, Partial Correlation and Incremental R^2 for the Matched Reliance Groups for Congress Knowledge

	Newspaper Reliant			Television Reliant		
	Simple r	Partial r	Incre. R^2	Simple r	Partial r	Incre. R^2
SES	.24	.17		.30	.20	
Age	.22	.13	9.49[a]	.18	.12	14.54[a]
Groups						
Family	-.03	-.17		.10	-.10	
Worker	.07	.07		.09	.12	
Admirer	.12	.08		.02	-.05	
Friend	.08	-.04	4.57[b]	.12	-.00	2.73
Political Interest	.26	.21	6.38[a]	.25	.11	1.90
Frequency						
Newspapers	.18	.10		.32	.25	
Television	-.12	-.03	1.59	-.12	-.07	4.34[b]
Non-Public Affairs						
Newspapers	-.33	-.27		-.16	-.24	
Television	-.21	-.06	6.95[a]	-.15	-.04	2.36
Attention						
Newspapers	.08	-.04		.13	-.09	
Television	.02	-.09	.80	.09	-.01	.15
Public Affairs						
Newspapers	.32	.25		.31	.23	
Television	.01	-.05	4.41[a]	.19	.14	6.15[a]
Media R^2	13.75			Media R2	13.00	
Total R^2	34.19[a]			Total R^2	32.17[a]	
Adjusted	29.35			Adjusted	23.77	
n=213				n=148		

a = $p \leq .01$
b = $p \leq .05$

Table 7

Correlation, Partial Correlation and Incremental R^2 for the Unmatched Reliance Groups for Congress Knowledge

	Newspaper Reliant			Television Reliant		
	Simple r	Partial r	Incre. R^2	Simple r	Partial r	Incre. R^2
SES	.45	.40		.26	.12	
Age	.14	.15	23.28[a]	.25	.28	13.67[a]
Groups						
Family	.20	.13		.30	.08	
Worker	.09	-.02		.19	.31	
Admirer	.03	.03		.15	.17	
Friend	.06	-.04	3.43	.16	.02	17.15[a]
Political Interest	.23	.01	.52	.33	.08	.85
Frequency						
Newspapers	.18	.10		.19	.12	
Television	.10	.05	1.15	-.08	.01	.48
Non-Public Affairs						
Newspapers	-.06	-.07		-.20	-.16	
Television	-.08	-.02	.43	-.30	-.14	5.39[b]
Attention						
Newspapers	.22	-.00		.31	.09	
Television	.17	.06	.57	.15	-.10	.88
Public Affairs						
Newspapers	.31	.11		.22	.07	
Television	.08	-.04	.85	.26	.02	.45
Media R^2	3.00			Media R^2	7.20	
Total R^2	30.23[b]			Total R^2	38.87[a]	
Adjusted	15.28			Adjusted	26.96	
n=98				n=102		

a = $p \leq .01$
b = $p \leq .05$

Table 8

Correlation, Partial Correlation and Incremental R^2 for the Matched Reliance Groups for Foreign Knowledge

	Newspaper Reliant			Television Reliant		
	Simple r	Partial r	Incre. R^2	Simple r	Partial r	Incre. R^2
SES	.21	.21		.23	.16	
Age	.02	-.12	4.44[a]	.02	.02	5.65[b]
Groups						
Family	-.08	-.19		-.05	-.21	
Worker	.09	.02		.17	.15	
Admirer	.03	-.06		-.08	-.15	
Friend	.06	-.09	1.43	.20	.05	7.99[b]
Political Interest	.14	.05	3.37[a]	.25	.22	5.09[a]
Frequency						
Newspapers	.10	.10		.27	.24	
Television	-.18	-.05	2.27	.02	.05	4.25[b]
Non-Public Affairs						
Newspapers	-.30	-.28		-.17	-.16	
Television	-.23	-.09	7.04[a]	-.07	-.00	2.37
Attention						
Newspapers	.03	-.07		.09	-.10	
Television	.05	.00	.00	.04	.00	.69
Public Affairs						
Newspapers	.33	.38		.13	.10	
Television	.02	.02	12.21[a]	-.08	-.07	.90
Media R^2	21.52			Media R^2	8.21	
Total R^2	30.76[a]			Total R^2	26.93[a]	
Adjusted	25.02			Adjusted	17.87	
n=213				n=148		

a = $p \leq .01$
b = $p \leq .05$

Table 9

Correlation, Partial Correlation and Incremental R^2 for the Unmatched Reliance Groups for Foreign Knowledge

	Newspaper Reliant			Television Reliant		
	Simple r	Partial r	Incre. R^2	Simple r	Partial r	Incre. R^2
SES	.25	.16		.04	.04	
Age	.02	.00	6.14	-.13	-.18	3.66
Groups						
Family	.13	-.03		.20	-.12	
Worker	-.03	-.11		.02	-.07	
Admirer	.05	.02		.13	.06	
Friend	.25	.13	6.33	.33	.06	10.25[b]
Political Interest	.28	.05	2.21	.40	.24	5.63[b]
Frequency						
Newspapers	.13	.05		.10	.13	
Television	-.03	.01	.77	-.05	.01	.88
Non-Public Affairs						
Newspapers	-.10	-.09		-.12	-.16	
Television	-.13	-.04	.66	-.08	-.01	1.87
Attention						
Newspapers	.26	.13		.22	-.01	
Television	.23	-.02	2.35	.22	-.08	.42
Public Affairs						
Newspapers	.32	.16		.24	.14	
Television	.02	-.09	2.65	.14	.01	1.61
Media R^2	6.43			Media R^2	4.78	
Total R^2	21.12 n.s.			Total R^2	24.31 n.s.	
Adjusted	4.21			Adjusted	9.57	
n=98				n=102		

a = $p \leq .01$
b = $p \leq .05$